

From: [Brennan, Brian](#)
To: [Lucki, Brenda](#); [Duheme, Michael](#); [Whelan, Alison](#)
Subject: RE: Thoughts?
Date: February 19, 2022 8:51:28 PM

I would agree that new legislation would be best for POEs and other critical infrastructure as a more consistent tool in a policing toolbox.

The big question would be the penalties to ensure it has the required level deterrents and consequences.

Brian

Sent from my Bell Samsung device over Canada's largest network.

----- Original message -----

From: "Lucki, Brenda" <brenda.lucki@rcmp-grc.gc.ca>
Date: 2022-02-19 8:32 p.m. (GMT-05:00)
To: "Brennan, Brian" <brian.brennan@rcmp-grc.gc.ca>, "Duheme, Michael" <Michael.Duheme@rcmp-grc.gc.ca>, "Whelan, Alison" <Alison.Whelan@rcmp-grc.gc.ca>
Subject: Thoughts?

From Transport DM Mike Keenan:

On question on exclusion zone,

- 1) I think we need new legislation as I don't know of any act (other than Emergency) under which we can write a reg to create exclusion zone.
- 2) the exclusion zone is defined by effect (blocking the normal operation. infrastructure) not specific geographic space, as the block can be miles away.
- 3) it is easy to include a specific list of critical federal trade and transportation infrastructure (ports, federal railways airports, federal pipelines) along with POEs - not really more complex. And all are in federal jurisdiction.

From Jody:

This is helpful. Yes it can blocks away - it's an all acres cannot be blockades approach. Whichever is the best way to do this ...Janice's point is - the consequences of shutting down Port Metro Vancouver is significant. Not just POEs.

From Mike K:

Exactly! And there are a decent number of places where rail blockades have economic devastation on same same scale as PMV or Ambassador Bridge. What we saw at Belleville two years ago is a traumatic example.

Solicitor-Client Priv.

Solicitor-Client Priv.

